

3/8/05

Bryan Woods, Rob Lewallen, Jim Salvatore, Carol Angus, Chuck DeMund, Kit Kesinger, Carole Wylie, Greg Roberson, Jim Hagey, Chris Anderson
Excused Absent: Julie Kiehne-Lamkin,

Dahvia Locke

Members of the public:

Charlene Ayers, Maureen Robertson, Carolyn Dorroh, Bill Jenkins, Robin Quaebasth, Dawn Perfect, Gary Vella, Bob Hailey, Jeff Vogel, Arvie Degenfelder, Paul Tarr III, Steve Powell, Beverly Ragsdale,
Meeting began at 7:10 pm

Pledge of Allegiance

Woods: Announced this is the last meeting of this phase and will follow the same format Through out the process.

Update of the RICC by Peggy Goldstein & Tom Fincher

Still conceptual stage. Motion to commend the effort of this group by DeMund 2nd Lewallen.

Discussion: Look at all projects collectively instead of individually cumulative impact issues (Ragsdale).

Unanimously approved.8/0/0

Workshops in 2003 & 2004 collectively and reviewed by this group. It is only a vision at this point. Phase 2 would be next with an expanded group. Goal tonight is to get this document to a final copy to go to print.

Refinements:

Lewallen: Motion to change the first Page to be: Final Initial Project Study Report 2nd DeMund Unanimously approved 10/0/0

Kesinger: Maps have changed. Maps are not consistent with each other.

Dahvia: Original boundary was relocated due to the vote at the beginning and the design standards would extend to the higher density of 7.3 the extension would cover the areas that are 7.3. The older boundary was arbitrary.

Kesinger was concerned that the expanded area would impact an area we don't want higher density and we should reduce it back to the original study.

Motion: to move the boundary maps back to the original boundary of our study. 2nd DeMund.

Clarification of area: Southern boundary to move back to E street (not G). Gateway is consistent to Raymond.

10/0/0 unanimously approved.

Kesinger: page 10 DRB: Update to be folded into the process... need to clarify that the DRB is to bring back their sub-committee report and have it approved by this body. Page

46: issue regarding the DRB defining the zoning. They are not the body to do this (Lewallen- DRB voted that that direction was outside their purview).

Kesinger Motion: DRB will recommend updates to the Design Standards to the Ramona Village Design Committee. 2nd by DeMund Unanimously approved 10/0/0

Page 46 issue: feeling is that the revision changes and clarifies the issue Kit had. Now 46 works. No change needed.

Page 15 under water: High desert line... insert semi arid Motion by Kesinger 2nd by Lewallen 10/0/0 unanimously approved.

Motion to delete the entire 3.3. 2nd Anderson

Discussion: we had discussion and agreed that the roundabouts were outside our Purview. Description and goal the analysis defines our analysis. Leave in because the public did bring this up and we should show that we discussed it. 9/1/0 Kesinger opposing Motion carried.

Kesinger: Page 36 Senior housing: Section ignores realistic concerns that some types of senior housing are not compatible with Ramona like any hospital. Incentive issues need to be removed. Cautions of senior housing on the infrastructure and identify the need for senior housing.

Angus: Difficult to do a study on senior housing. There are allot of seniors and types of housing. We are growing and there is a large population that will be in that category soon. Extremely complicated and we need assistance from someone that knows the issue. Woods: 2nd dwelling unit won't cut it. We need to address the issue that will be hitting us. Motion by Kesinger: to delete task one as stated. No Second.

Roberson: would be more comfortable if you replace the motion with another not just deleting it.

The next reiteration separate senior housing from senior care.

Lewallen: 3.3 to state Existing condition, proposed solutions & infrastructure & the task to be determined in phase 2. Second by Angus 10/0/0 unanimously approved.

Kesinger: Under analysis it needs to address the cautions.

DeMund: The last motion cleared it up.

Julie's comments:

1. Change initial project study – done in our first motion.

Move to adopt number 3 of page 1 of Julie's comments by Lewallen. 2nd by DeMund. 10/0/0 Unanimously.

Move to adopt item 4 of Julie's memo regarding Dark sky Policy with the modification of the County's Dark sky policy not Ramona's. 2nd by DeMund. Unanimously approved 10/0/0

Move to adopt Julie's modification to 5 page 15 of 77. To remove "within their governmental context". 2nd DeMund. Unanimously approved 10/0/0

DeMund: Move to adopt Julie's item 7 for discussion in phase 2. Lewallen 2nd. 10/0/0
Unanimously Approved.

Lewallen: Move to adopt Julie's modifications Item 8 pages 19 of 77 on project analysis: 2nd DeMund. Unanimously Approved 10/0/0

Lewallen moved item 9 of Julie's Modification. 2nd by DeMund. Unanimously Approved 10/0/0/

Motion by Woods to adopt item 10 of Julie's modifications. 2nd by Wylie. Justification does not enter into this motion only the recommendation. Unanimously approved 10/0/0

Motion by Lewallen item 13 page 38 adhere to the County's Dark sky Policy pedestrian enhancement 1 & 2 Change Ramona to County. Unanimously approved 10/0/0

Motion to adopt 15 page 49 modifications by Julie: Change from building form and function. 2nd by DeMund. Form & function go hand in hand with zoning matrix. Unanimously approved. 10/0/0

Motion by Lewallen: Delete general dissertation on conventional zoning regulations, form-based codes, and performance-based zoning. 2nd by DeMund. Reference the need to deal with this in Phase 2. Get rid of pages 65 to 70.

Motion amended to delete pages 65 to 70 but reference the need to deal with this issue in Phase 2. 2nd agreed with the amendment. Title to strike strategies and change to Potential Zoning Regulation Descriptions on page 49.

Discussion: These are the analysis of Mike and this is his work with no recommendation.

Unanimously Approved 10/0/0

Page 49 in second paragraphs. Editorial comments ...This type of zoning uses measurements to build places which ... to be bolded.

Item 17 of Julie's modifications Page 55 of 77:

Live/Work

DeMund: Motion to modify the map to reflect no mixed use in Gateway. 2nd Kesinger
Unanimously Approved 10/0/0

Item 18 of Julie's modifications:

DeMund: Motion to make the map reflect the areas where we approved the mixed use which was none on Main Street, to enlarge the map & also to define in words on the map that it excluded Main Street. (Extend this motion to all the maps). 2nd Angus.

Unanimously Approved. 10/0/0

Lewallen: item 19. Comments from Ramona citizens and groups... Motion to incorporate comments and the appendix should reflect comments. 2nd by DeMund.

Unanimously Approved 10/0/0

Hagey: Shared Parking in Phase 2: Hold until we are finished here with revisions.

Kesinger: It is implied that all members support and approve this document by their names. He wants it noted that not this entire document was agreed upon this document.

Salvatore: This is the approval of the body of the group.

Woods: we can publish the voting record. 90% of the voting record was unanimously voted on.

We are to look at the whole project

DeMund: Motion to recommend that the revisions to be adopted and this document be published, dispersed to all appropriate bodies for review and that the comments be attached as an addendum as it moves into phase 2. 2nd Salvatore

Bill Jenkins: Thank all of us as we have done our due diligence. Thank you for considering the vinticulture. Senior Housing project is great to get the sub-committee started. Finally, the RCPG certainly has a concern with them. Motion was that commercial only on Main Street. Chamber of Commerce was also office professional on Main Street.

Paul Tarr III: Obviously you have reviewed all the words of this. Following since October. Looking at Phase 1 which is research and visioning and phase 2 is planning and administration... this has jumped out at him... with higher density we are going to create more traffic and doesn't see any more jobs and the county has stopped it with the TIF. Has a problem with page 21 beginning of paragraph 2 regarding circulation. Higher density of working class & not addressing new jobs for them and no strong recommendation on the challenges of circulation. Feels it is premature to move to phase 2.

Robin Quasebarth: Eucalyptus Trees. Engelmann Oaks are here and they are special and unique to Ramona and just fell off the endangered list. Senior downsizing to open up their big house to smaller houses and less acreage. Dean Butterfield – April 6th tentatively speaking to RCPG and has knowledge discuss senior projects.

Beverly Ragsdale: Nothing that addresses the major problems we have now and that all these projects will impact the circulation and we need to address this NOW and all together. Has a large concern that with the way this committee was formed. Agrees with Kit that he doesn't want his name with this total document.

Concerns with the way the boundaries were created and adjusted in this committee some were not in the purview of this committee. Again we need to address the issue of the poor traffic circulation.

Dawn Perfect: First, some portions have been left out. Specific park development plan including funding a specific park development plan. 2nd Ramona roads master plan 3rd item Ramona trails plan and standards. 4th prioritized list of road infrastructure added to and amended frequently and added as an appendix. Rest will be typed by Dawn and provided to the committee.

Close public discussion.

Lewallen: 54% of the current existing community plan is what we as a group have recommended. Based solely on vacant land. Identified exposure for our community is any redevelopment. Rebuttals to preliminary final report. He was hearing that we were adding 10,000 people to the core. Existing plan calls for an additional 2400 people that number would be 2260 and a minimum it would be 824 averages is 1540. We were not adding more we were adding 50 to 60% of what we can have of our existing community plan.

Angus: our existing is 78,000 pop. Now it is 56,000. In the late 80's it was realistically at 68,000.

Wylie: Mixed use. People are worried about the term mixed used. She is more afraid of stuff like D Street. Zoned commercial and not able to have a residential use at all! Not pushing for box apartments but rather a blend of use. Define with what fits into our Ramona character.

DeMund: Allow that to happen but restrict the apartment houses. We need to address that at this committee in future phases.

Lewallen: Incorporation group back in the 80's. What this group is doing is what a city would be doing.

Motion to call for the question: 10/0/0

Vote on the motion: 9/1/0 Kesinger opposed.

Kesinger: Motion to add a notation of how each person voted on this document on the front page. 2nd Salvatore

Discussion: not in favor of it being on the front page. Maybe as an addendum at the back. Opposed due to it is in conflict of all other bodies.

Amend the motion that we create an addendum that states unanimous votes and clarifies the votes that were not unanimous. By Kesinger 2nd Salvatore
8/2/0 Anderson & DeMund opposed.

PHASE 2:

We do not have the time condition and in light of that the recommendation that we add two more planning group members to the group and Bill Jenkins and Andrew Simmons are the chosen members. The process will be more similar to the BOS where we have public discussion at time of the item on the agenda. Time limitations but at time of item not after the motion has been voted on.

Next 3 or 4 weeks need to see who wants to remain on the committee and formulate what we do next.

Report will be submitted to be printed and start the process of review. Applied for money for phase 2. We expect that the RCPG and the public may not like the entire document but may support the majority of it.

Adjourned at 9:45 pm

Respectfully submitted by,

Chris Anderson